

REMARKSI. INTERVIEW WITH MR. DUANE SMITH

During the week of July 15, 2007, after reviewing the non-final Office action of July 12, 2007, Applicants' representatives attempted to contact Examiner Popovics, who was unavailable.

The Office action did not include information regarding Examiner Popovics' supervisor. Thus, Applicants' representatives searched the USPTO website for the name and contact information of Examiner Popovic's supervisor. Thereafter, Applicants' representatives contacted Mr. Duane Smith.

- (A) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted: No exhibit was shown. No demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Identification of the claims discussed: No claims were discussed.
- (C) Identification of specific prior art discussed: No art of record was discussed.
- (D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner: No amendments were discussed.
- (E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner: No arguments were put forth.
- (F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed:

During the interview conducted on the week of July 15, 2007, with Mr. Duane Smith, Applicants' representative expressed concern that the Office action did not seem to address the supplemental amendment filed on January 29, 2007. Applicants' representative expressed concern that the supplemental amendment filed on January 29,

2007, might have been overlooked.

(G) If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview:

Mr. Smith indicated that he would direct Examiner Popovics to correct the Office action when Examiner Popovics returned from vacation.

## II. INTERVIEW WITH EXAMINER POPOVICS

On July 23, 2007, Examiner Popovics, contacted Applicants' representatives.

- (A) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted: No exhibit was shown. No demonstration was conducted.
- (B) Identification of the claims discussed: No claims were discussed.
- (C) Identification of specific prior art discussed: No art of record was discussed.
- (D) Identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary form completed by the examiner: No amendments were discussed.
- (E) The general thrust of the principal arguments of the applicant and the examiner: No arguments were put forth.
- (F) A general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed:

During the interview conducted on July 23, 2007, Examiner Popovics indicated that any concern over the failure of the substantive portion of the Office action to address, or to acknowledge the supplemental amendment filed on January 29, 2007, was ill-founded, because the Office Action Summary (Form PTOL-326) indicated that the Office

action was responsive to communication(s) filed on: 4/23/07, 1/29/07 and 12/18/06.

Examiner Popovics asked several times whether Applicants' representative was satisfied with the completeness of the Office action. Applicants' representative echoed the dissatisfaction of Examiner Popovics' supervisor.

Examiner Popovics asked Applicants' representative to point out specific deficiencies in the Office action. Applicants' representative indicated that a written reply would be filed, addressing the specific deficiencies.

(G) If appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview: No agreement was reached.